

REMARKS

Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 9 and make it clear that the second portion coupled to the bent section is elongated. In a telephone interview that occurred on June 11, 2003, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed the distinctions between then pending claim 9 (now incorporated into independent claim 8) and it is believed that agreement was reached that claim 8, as presently presented is patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Since the limitations of Claim 9 have been incorporated into Claim 8, Claims 9 and 15 have been cancelled and claim 10 is amended to now depend from Claim 8.

As discussed in the interview that occurred on June 11th, it is believed that the combination of Tomimaru and Mizutani does not reasonably suggest the various combinations set forth in the pending claims. It is acknowledged that Tomimaru appears to disclose a motor having an output shaft and a power supplying terminal. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner, the geometry of the terminal disclosed by Tomimaru is very different than the claimed terminal geometry. The Examiner has relied on Mizutani (in combination with Tomimaru) in an effort to show the claimed terminal construction. However, it is respectfully submitted that even the combination of Tomimaru using the terminal disclosed by Mizutani does meet or reasonably suggest the claimed terminal geometry. Specifically, the claimed terminal must include:

- a first portion extending substantially parallel to the output shaft;
- a bent section coupled to the first portion, curving outward and away from the motor body, the bent section immediately adjacent to the first portion and maintaining a position at least as far from the motor body as the first portion;
- an elongated second portion coupled to the bent section, the elongated second portion extending substantially parallel to the first portion; and
- a third portion comprising a grounding portion projecting outward in a curved manner from the second portion.

The Examiner relies on 51(d) of Mizutani as the “first portion”, 51(c) as the bent section, 51(e) as the second portion and 51(c) again as the “third” portion.

Initially, claim 8, as presently presented (and as previously pending) requires that the bent section be immediately adjacent the first section. As can be clearly seen by Fig. 4 of Mizutani, element 51(c) (i.e., the bent section relied on by the examiner) is not “immediately adjacent” element 51(d) (i.e., the first portion relied on by the Examiner). Thus, the combination of elements 51(c) and 51(d) of Mizutani relied on by the Examiner to meet the claimed first

portion and bent section do not meet the claim language. It is noted that 51(e) is bent and immediately adjacent to 51(d), however, element 51(e) does not maintain a position at least as far from the motor body as the first portion as required by claim 8. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that neither Mizutani nor any reasonable combination of Tomimaru and Mizutani suggest the claimed relationship between the first portion and the bent section.

Claim 8 further requires that the "second portion" must be elongated and substantially parallel to the first portion. It is respectfully submitted that Mizutani does not disclose any elongated second portion of the terminal that is parallel to a first portion. With respect to the outstanding rejection, it is respectfully submitted that portion 51(c) is neither elongated nor does it extend parallel to portion 51(d).

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that the third portion 51(c) of Mizutani relied on by the Examiner does not project outwardly in a curved manner from any part of the terminal that runs parallel to 51(d).

In view of the foregoing and other distinctions between the claimed inventions and the Tomimaru and Mizutani references, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record and that this case should be passed to issue.

If the Examiner has any continuing concerns about the application, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. SIP1P045).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Steve D Beyer
Reg. No. 31,234

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778